

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8 UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
9 WESTERN DISTRICT OF WASHINGTON
10 AT TACOMA

11 CARLOS WILLIAMS,

12 Plaintiff,

13 v.

14 LORI LAWSON, et al.,

15 Defendants.

16 CASE NO. C21-5536 MJP

17 ORDER DENYING MOTION TO
18 COMPEL AND MOTION FOR
19 RECONSIDERATION

20 This matter comes before the Court on Plaintiff's Motion to Compel (Dkt. No. 118) and
21 Motion for Reconsideration (Dkt. No. 147). Having reviewed both Motions, Defendants' Report
22 to the Court Re: Plaintiff's Access to Case Documents (Dkt. No. 157), and all supporting
23 materials, the Court DENIES both Motions.

24 The Court previously denied Plaintiff's motion to compel his former counsel's files as
moot because counsel had produced them to Plaintiff. (See Order Denying Motions to Compel as
Moot (Dkt. No. 136).) The Court noted, however, that it was not clear whether Plaintiff had
access to his former counsel's files given his condition of confinement. (Id. at 2.) The Court

1 ordered Defendant to report on whether and how Plaintiff has access to these materials, which
2 they have done. (Dkt. No. 157.)

3 The Court DENIES both Motions.

4 First, the relief Plaintiff seeks from his Motion to Compel overlaps with his prior two
5 motions to compel. (Compare Dkt. No. 118 with Dkt. Nos. 91, 109.) The Court's ruling denying
6 the prior two motions to compel applies equally to this duplicative motion. (See Dkt. No. 136.)
7 The Court therefore DENIES Plaintiff's Motion to Compel as MOOT. (Dkt. No. 118.)

8 Second, the Court DENIES Plaintiff's Motion for Reconsideration of the Court's Order
9 on the first two motions to compel (Dkt. No. 136). (Mot. for Reconsideration (Dkt. No. 147).)
10 "Motions for reconsideration are disfavored." Local Civil Rule 7(h)(1). "The court will
11 ordinarily deny such motions in the absence of a showing of manifest error in the prior ruling or
12 a showing of new facts or legal authority which could not have been brought to its attention
13 earlier with reasonable diligence." Id. Plaintiff has not identified any manifest error or new facts
14 or authority that could not have been presented earlier. And based on the representations made
15 by Defendants in their Notice (Dkt. No. 157), Plaintiff has access to his legal materials, subject
16 to the restrictions imposed by the policies of the Department of Corrections. The Court therefore
17 finds no basis to reconsider its ruling and DENIES the Motion for Reconsideration.

18 The clerk is ordered to provide copies of this order to Plaintiff and all counsel.

19 Dated April 10, 2023.

20 

21 Marsha J. Pechman
22 United States Senior District Judge
23
24